

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/036,040	Applicant(s) FUJIHARA ET AL.	
	Examiner Shefali D. Patel	Art Unit 2621	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Shefali D. Patel, (The Examiner). (3) _____
 (2) David J. Torrente (Reg. No. 49,099). (4) _____

Date of Interview: 08 December 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,5,6 and 8.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kori.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant summarized the differences between claims 6, 8 and the prior art of record by Kori (US 6,687,802). Claims 6 and 8 distinguish over Kori ("the controller blocks the transfer of the input image content data so as NOT to produce the output image content data.") However the proposed amended claims changes the scope of the claim as a whole and would require further search and/or consideration.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

JOSEPH MANCUSO
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

400 Garden City Plaza - Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343 - Telephone
(516) 742-4366 - Facsimile
e-mail: Intprop@ssmp.com

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER

Fax

To: Exmr. S. Patel	From: David J. Torrente
Fax: 571-273-7695	Pages: 7
Phone: 571-272-7695	Date: 07-Dec-05
Re: SN 10-036,040	CC:

☐ Urgent ☐ For Review ☐ Please Comment ☐ Please Reply ☐ Please Recycle

• **Comments:**

For your consideration in advance of our interview (Scheduled Thu. 12/8/05 at 11:00 AM)

CONFIDENTIALITY: The documents accompanying this facsimile transmission may contain information which is either confidential or legally privileged and is intended only for the authorized use of the individual or entity named above without right or publication or republication, dissemination or disclosure except as expressly set forth or established by course of dealing. All rights are reserved. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this facsimile is prohibited. If you received this transmission in error, please notify us immediately by telephone to arrange for return of the documents.

**Please Deliver to Examiner S. Patel
For Discussion Only – DO NOT ENTER**

1. (Cancelled) ~~An image data processing device for processing an input image content data to produce an output image content data, comprising:
—— a detector for detecting a permission limiting watermark from the input image content data; and
—— a controller for controlling transferring and blocking of the input image content data such that the output image content data is produced from the input image content data a limited number of times when the permission limiting watermark is detected.~~
2. (Currently Amended) The image data processing device according to claim [[1]] 6, wherein the limited number of times is determined by the permission limiting watermark.
3. (Original) The image data processing device according to claim 2, wherein the input image content data is inputted when a copy is performed.
4. (Original) The image data processing device according to claim 3, wherein the permission limiting watermark is a copy-once watermark indicating that a copy is permitted only once.
5. (Cancelled) ~~The image data processing device according to claim 1, further comprising:
—— an additional watermark inserter for inserting an additional watermark in the input image content data to produce the output image content data when the copy is performed.~~

**Please Deliver to Examiner S. Patel
For Discussion Only – DO NOT ENTER**

6. (Currently Amended) ~~The image data processing device according to claim 5, wherein the controller comprises:~~ An image data processing device for processing an input image content data to produce an output image content data, comprising:

a detector for detecting a permission limiting watermark from the input image content data;

a controller for controlling transferring and blocking of the input image content data such that the output image content data is produced from the input image content data a limited number of times when the permission limiting watermark is detected;

an additional watermark inserter for inserting an additional watermark in the input image content data to produce the output image content data when the copy is performed; and

an additional watermark detector for detecting the additional watermark from the input image content data,

wherein, when the additional watermark is detected from the input image content data, the controller blocks the transfer of the input image content data so as not to produce the output image content data.

7. (Currently Amended) The image data processing device according to claim [[5]] 6, wherein the additional watermark inserter blocks the transfer of the input image content data under control of the controller when the additional watermark is detected.

8. (Previously Presented) A data processing device for processing an input content data to produce an output content data, comprising:

**Please Deliver to Examiner S. Patel
For Discussion Only – DO NOT ENTER**

a first detector for detecting a permission limiting watermark from the input content data;
a second detector for detecting an additional watermark from the input content data,
wherein the additional watermark is inserted when an original content is copied; and
a controller for producing the output content data from the input content data when the permission limiting watermark and the additional watermark are both detected and prohibiting production of the output content data when the permission limiting watermark is detected and the additional watermark is not detected.

9. (Previously Presented) The data processing device according to claim 8, wherein the input content data is inputted when playback is performed.

10. (Previously Presented) A data processing device for processing an input content data to produce an output content data, comprising:

a first detector for detecting a permission limiting watermark from the input content data;
a second detector for detecting an additional watermark from the input content data,
wherein the additional watermark is inserted when an original content is copied; and
a controller for producing the output content data from the input content data when the permission limiting watermark and the additional watermark are both detected and prohibiting production of the output content data when the permission limiting watermark is detected and the additional watermark is not detected; and
a third detector for detecting a type of a medium storing the input content data,
wherein,

**Please Deliver to Examiner S. Patel
For Discussion Only – DO NOT ENTER**

when the medium is writable, the controller produces the output content data from the input content data when the permission limiting watermark and the additional watermark are both detected and prohibits production of the output content data when the permission limiting watermark is detected and the additional watermark is not detected,

when the medium is not writable, the controller unconditionally produces the output content data from the input content data.

11. (Currently Amended) The data processing device according to claim [[1]]_6, wherein the input content data is compressed data conforming to MPEG standard.

12. (Previously Presented) The data processing device according to claim 8, wherein the input content data is compressed data conforming to MPEG standard.

13. (Currently Amended) The data processing device according to claim [[1]]_6, wherein the input content data is digital data corresponding to an analog composite signal.

14. (Previously Presented) The data processing device according to claim 8, wherein the input content data is digital data corresponding to an analog composite signal.

Claims 15-18 (Cancelled)

19. (Previously Presented) A playback permission method comprising the steps of:

**Please Deliver to Examiner S. Patel
For Discussion Only – DO NOT ENTER**

determining whether a permission limiting watermark is embedded in content data stored in a medium;

determining whether an additional watermark is embedded in the content data, wherein the additional watermark is inserted when the content data is copied;

detecting a type of a medium storing the content;

when the medium is writable,

permitting playback of the content when the permission limiting watermark and the additional watermark are both detected; and

prohibiting playback of the content when the permission limiting watermark is detected and the additional watermark is not detected; and

when the medium is not writable, unconditionally permitting playback of the content.

Please Deliver to Examiner S. Patel
For Discussion Only – DO NOT ENTER
ABSTRACT

An image data processing device allowing both of user side and provider side to obtain benefits, leading to market expansion, is disclosed. When an image content is copied, an additional watermark is inserted into the copied image content. When an additional watermark is detected from input image content data, a further copy of the image content is prohibited.